

THE SHIA: KILLERS OF SAYYIDUNA HUSAYN رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Adapted and Translated from:

Tahdhīr ul Muslimīn an Kayd al-Kādhibīn
Maulānā Allāhyār Khān

*An Investigation from the Books of the *Shia**



TRANSLATED BY:

As SAWA'IQ AL MUHRIQAH

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

The Oppressed Imām:

Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ gave his life, forlorn, far away from home. The great sacrifice that he gave and made his family give their lives cannot be found in the history of humanity. What must be observed is that, from whom did these difficulties come upon this great son of Islām, whose hand was stretched out towards him and why?

The eye-witness to this incident was either the killer or those who survived. This is because a simple method of research and investigation is to enquire from the oppressed, “Who was your killer?” and the group of killers should be asked, “What is your response to the claim?” After the claim is made, if the accused attests to his crime, then there remains no need for any testimony. After the accused attests to the crime, he does not remain accused, but he will be classified as a criminal.

Subject Matter:

Who were the killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ? *Shia* or non-*Shia*?

Preamble to the Answer:

1. Who is the claimant?
2. Who is the defendant, i.e. against who is the claimant making the claim?
3. Who are the witnesses?

4. Are they eye-witnesses or did they hear the testimony of the witnesses?
5. If this testimony corresponds to the explanation of the claimant, then the claim will be proven. If it contradicts, then the incident should be studied and scrutinized in the light of these statements.

Preamble 1:

The claimant is Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه, his household and his companions. They were oppressed. **Bear in mind that according to the *Shia*, the Imām is infallible, i.e. he is pure from major and minor sins and it is compulsory to obey him.**

Preamble 2:

The defendants are all those people who called the Imām and killed him oppressively.

Preamble 3:

In the light of the law, the witness should be someone not from the claimants or defendants.

Preamble 4:

There was no eye-witness who could narrate the incident because Karbala was an open and plain field. There was no habitation around. Therefore, whichever witness will present his case; his testimony will be what he heard.

Preamble 5:

Because the testimony is heard from someone else, it must be studied whether the witness narrates it from the mouth of the killer, or from the mouth of the killed. Whichever one is taken, it must be scrutinized and seen if the testimony of the claimant is in harmony with the claim. If so, it will be accepted, otherwise rejected. If the testimony contradicts the explanation of the claimant, then it will necessitate that the witness belies the claimant and why should the testimony of someone who belies the infallible Imām be accepted? Therefore, any narration or information that comes from any narrator, mentioned in any book will necessarily be rejected.

After this research, whoever is proven to be the criminal, it will be binding on every Muslim to take him to be the criminal, otherwise, the following verse will apply to him,

وَمَنْ يَكْسِبْ خَطِيئَةً أَوْ إِثْمًا ثُمَّ يَرْمِ بِهِ بَرِيًّا فَقَدْ احْتَمَلَ بُهْنَانًا وَإِثْمًا مُّبِينًا

But whoever earns an offense or a sin and then blames it on an innocent [person] has taken upon himself a slander and manifest sin.¹



¹ [Sūrah an-Nisā: 112]

Detail of the Claim:

1. Explanations of the Claimants:

1.1 Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ addresses the army of the enemy in the plain of Karbala

“O people of Kufa, woe be to you, have you forgotten your letters and promises which you wrote to us, making Allāh شَهَادَةً وَعَلَىٰ a witness, that the *Ahl ul Bayt* should come and you will sacrifice your lives for them? Woe be to you, we have come upon your call and you have handed us over to Ibn Ziyād. You have stopped the water supply from the Euphrates to us. Definitely, you have gone against Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, you deal with his family in this way. May Allāh شَهَادَةً وَعَلَىٰ not quench you on the Day of *Qiyāmah*.²”²

Two things are proven from the explanation of Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

1. The people of Kufa wrote letters to Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, called him to Kufa and promised him their help, stating that they are ready to give their lives.

2. Those who wrote letters to him, calling him to Kufa, had closed off the water supply and handed him over to Ibn Ziyād to be killed.

Now, let us see whether those who called Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were *Shia* or non-*Shia*.

² Dhabh Adhīm from Nāsikh ut Tawārīkh p.335

Qādī Nūrullāh Shostarī (*Shia*), writes in *Majālis ul Mu'minīn* p.25, Majlis Awwal,

‘There is no need for any proof to show that the people of Kufa were *Shia*. It goes against the original to state that the Kufans were Sunni. This is in need of proof, although Abū Hanīfah was a Kufan.’

In accordance to the testimony of the *Shia* scholar, the *Shia* status of the Kufans is clearer than the sun. Despite this, we present two more proofs.

1. When Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ got news of the martyrdom of Muslim at Ziyālah, he said, “Our *Shia* have disgraced us.”³
2. *Jilā ul 'Uyūn* (Urdu) transmits the narration that Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ addressed the *Shia* at the battle in Karbala and said, **‘May you and your intentions be cursed. O treacherous ones, you called us to help you in your tumult of desperation. When I took your word and came to help you and guide you, then you drew out the sword of malice against me. You supported our enemy and helped them and have abandoned your friends.’**

From these explanations it is proven that the *Shia* called Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ. They stopped the water supply and they are the ones who handed him over to Ibn Ziyād to be killed.

From the above narration of *Jilā ul 'Uyūn*, the words ‘sword of malice’ is worthy of scrutiny, i.e. the Kufan *Shia* had some old hatred in their hearts. Therefore, with the objective of taking revenge, they played this trick. In terms of history, what else could be the reason for this terrible

³ *Khulāsatul Masā'ib* p.49

enmity other than the fact that the representatives of Islām and companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ caused the people of Kufa to leave their ancestral religion and adopt the treasure of Islām? They also caused a centuries' old empire to fall at the feet of the Arab Muslims. At the end, it was national and religious fervour and fanaticism that came to the fore.

Findings:

In accordance to the explanation of claimant 1, the killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ were the *Shia* of Kufa, no one else.

Explanation of Claimant 2: Imām Zayn ul 'Ābidīn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ

“O people, I take an oath in the name of Allāh and ask you, do you not know that you wrote letters to my father and deceived him? You made resolute promises and promised allegiance, and then you killed and disgraced him. Destruction is for you for what you have sent forth for yourselves and destruction is for your evil opinion. With which eye will you look at Rasūlullāh ﷺ when he will tell you, ‘You killed my children, you dishonored me. You are not of my ummah.’”

They started crying aloud and began cursing each other, “You are destroyed and you have knowledge of it.”⁴

From this explanation it is established that he addressed those who called Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ, and they were the killers. In response, their confession is also present.

⁴ *Iḥtijāj Tabrāsī* p.159, Iran

‘When Zayn ul ‘Ābidīn was coming with the women folk from Karbala, whilst ill, the women of Kufa tore their clothing and the men were crying. In a soft tone, Zayn ul ‘Ābidīn said, “Because of illness, I have become weak. The people of Kufa are crying but tell me, who killed us besides them?”⁵

Mullā Bāqir Majlīsī writes in *Jilā ul ‘Uyūn* p.503, ‘Zayn ul ‘Ābidīn said in a low voice, “You are wailing and mourning over us, but tell me, who killed us?”

The answer is veiled in the question and his tone

Findings from the Explanation of Claimant 2:

1. The people of Kufa wrote the letters
2. The people of Kufa deceived the Imām
3. The people of Kufa killed the Imām
4. The people of Kufa were *Shia*
5. The Kufan *Shia*, the killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ are not part of the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ
6. The killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ cried and their women tore their clothing and established their own practices.

Bear in mind that (according to *Shia* thought), both claimants are infallible. Therefore, they are true in their claims.

⁵ Ibid p.158

Explanation of Claimant 3: Sayyidah Zaynab bint Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهَا, sister of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ

When the prisoners of Karbala returned from Karbala and entered Kufa, then the men and women of Kufa began to cry and beat themselves. Upon this, Sayyidah Zaynab bint Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهَا said, “After praising Allāh and salutations upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ, O people of Kufa, O oppressors, O treacherous ones, O those who disgrace, very evil is that which you have sent forth for yourselves, Allāh is displeased with you and you will remain in punishment forever. You cry, yes, you cry, because this is what behooves of you. Cry in abundance and laugh less. What reply will you give to Rasūlullāh ﷺ tomorrow when he asks you, “You are the last ummah, how did you deal with my family and children after me? You captured some of them and returned some of them to dust and blood.””

Bāqir Majlisī translated this address in *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.503 in the following way,

“O people of Kufa, O treacherous plotters, you cry and wail upon us, whereas you are the ones who killed us. Our crying has not stopped from your oppression and our pleas have not stopped from your trouble and difficulty. You have sent forth very evil provision for yourselves in the hereafter and have made yourselves worthy of eternal damnation to hell. You cry and wail over us, whereas you are the ones who killed us. Your hands will be cut off. O people of Kufa, destruction be for you, you have killed the beloved of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and have unveiled the veiled *Ahl ul Bayt*. How have you shed the blood of the son of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and destroyed his honor.”

Findings:

1. The people of Kufa called the Imām through their schemes and plots
2. They were treacherous to the Imām and killed the *Ahl ul Bayt*
3. After doing all this, they began to cry and beat themselves
4. They were given glad tidings of hell
5. The killers were those who called him, the *Shia*. They were the ones who did the crimes and the *Shia* were the ones who were classified as worthy of eternal residence in hell

Explanation of Claimant 4: Sayyidah Fātimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا daughter of Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Iḥtijāj Tabrāsī p.157 states,

“O people of Kufa, O plotters and treacherous ones, you have belied us and taken us to be disbelievers. You have taken our blood to be permissible to shed and have taken our wealth as booty, as you have done with the progeny of the Turks and the people of Kabul. As you have killed our grandfather (Sayyidunā Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) yesterday, your swords are dripping with our blood. On account of your previous malice, your eyes have been cooled, your hearts are pleased, you were bold against Allāh and plotted and schemed and Allāh will punish you severely for this.”

Findings from the explanation of Sayyidah Fātimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا:

1. The *Shia* of Kufa classified the *Ahl ul Bayt* as disbelievers and made their blood permissible to shed
2. The *Shia* had old enmity for the *Ahl ul Bayt*
3. They killed the *Ahl ul Bayt* and were pleased with their deed
4. Their crying and beating was only an act

Explanation of Claimant 5: Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, sister of Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

When some women started giving the children of the *Ahl ul Bayt*, dates from charity, then the wet nurse said, “Charity is forbidden for us.” Hearing us, the Kufan women started crying and hitting themselves.” Upon this, the wet nurse said, “O people of Kufa, charity is forbidden for us. O women of Kufa, your men killed our men. They imprisoned us, the *Ahl ul Bayt*, so why are you crying?”⁶

The Findings are clear:

The explanations of all 5 claimants mention the same points as counted hereunder:

1. The people of Kufa called Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they wrote letters to him
2. Those who invited were *Shia*

⁶ *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.507

3. The *Shia* who called and invited had killed the Imām (Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه), they captured the *Ahl ul Bayt* and looted their belongings
4. The wives of the killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه tore their clothing
5. The killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه i.e. the *Shia*, are out of the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ

Look at the explanation of another personality, who can also be termed as a claimant and a witness. Imām Bāqir رحمة الله . He must have heard the incident as narrated to him by his father, Imām Zayn ul Ābidīn رحمة الله , and according to the *Shia*, he is also infallible.

Jilā ul Uyūn p.326 states,

‘When he pledged allegiance to *Amīr ul Mu’minīn*, he then turned away from his pledge and drew out his sword. *Amīr ul Mu’minīn* was always at loggerheads with him and got lot of difficulty from him, to the extent that he martyred him. He pledged allegiance to his son Imām Hasan رضي الله عنه and after pledging allegiance; he went against him and plotted. He wanted to hand him over to the enemy. The people of Iraq came in front and showed their daggers. They looted the tents to the extent that they removed the jewellery that was on the feet of the women and troubled and taunted them, until they made a treaty with Mu’āwiyah and protected the blood of the *Ahl ul Bayt*. The numbers of the *Ahl ul Bayt* were few. So, a thousand Iraqi men pledged allegiance to Imām Husayn رضي الله عنه and those who pledged allegiance were the same ones

who used their sword against him. The yolk of the pledge was on their necks when they martyred the Imām.”

The matter is clear from this explanation

Proofs for the Old Malice:

Sayyidah Fātimah bint Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا explains the old malice, history records her words,

1. *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.230 states that Abdur Rahmān Ibn Muljim had pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He pledged allegiance and then martyred him.

It is said that he was a *Khārijī*. However, we do not find this mentioned in the history books that the *Khawārij* pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He was totally opposed to Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he would not even make *taqiyya*. When Ibn Muljim pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, he was part of the *Shi'ān Ali*, i.e. the killer of Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was also a *Shia*.

2. *Iḥtijāj Tabrāsī* p.150, Iran states that Sayyidunā Hasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said, “By Allāh, I feel that Mu'āwiyah is better than my *Shia*. They claim to be my *Shia* and they wanted to kill me and loot my wealth.”

From these quotations it is clear that the *Shia* killed Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they wanted to kill Sayyidunā Hasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and loot his wealth and they killed Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This is most probably the reason why Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had the hope of giving ten of his *Shia* in exchange of one man of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

In *Nahj ul Balāgha* vol.1 p.189, Sayyidunā Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ said, “So take ten from me and give me one of them.”

It is as though the companions of Mu’āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ are so able in faith and trustworthiness that Sayyidunā Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ was ready to give ten of his *Shia* in exchange of one of his men.

The Qur’ān speaks about the link between one and ten,

إِنْ يَكُنْ مِنْكُمْ عَشْرُونَ صَابِرُونَ يَغْلِبُوا مُؤْمِنِينَ

It is possible that Sayyidunā Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ made a comparison and considered this.

Sayyidunā Hasan رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ and *Sayyidunā Husayn* رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ had great reliance on *Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah* رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ and he even protected both of them. Both of them pledged allegiance to *Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah* رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ and they would take a stipend from him. Contrary to this, the *Shia* wanted to kill one brother and they killed the other.

Now we must study the response given by the defendant. If the defendant confesses to the crime, then there is no need for testimony. If the defendant denies, then a witness will be necessary.

Explanation of the Defendant:

In *Majālis ul Mu’minīn*, Qādī Nūrullāh Shostarī explains,

‘Now we want to regret over our evil deeds. Repent. Probably Allāh will have mercy on us and accept our repentance. From this group, whoever went to Karbala to kill the Imām, as part of the army of Ibn Ziyād, they should all present their excuse. Sulaymān Ibn Surad said, “There is no

way out except that we destroy ourselves in the plain like the *Banī Isrā’īl* killed each other, as Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says, ‘You have oppressed yourselves...’ Saying this, all the *Shia* repented and fell to their knees.’

Note: This Sulaymān Ibn Surad was the same person in whose house the *Shia* had gathered to prepare the invitation for Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ to come to Kufa.

The defendant has confessed to the crime and repented, but what is the benefit?

The defendant confessed to the crime and it has been proven that the killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ were the Kufan *Shia*, those who called him and then killed him mercilessly. However, for sake of caution, we should investigate further. It is possible that the hand of someone else is also in this.

Khulāsatul Maṣā’ib p.201 states,

‘Among the killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, there was no Shāmī or Hijāzī, but all of them were Kufī.’

It is clear that the people of Kufa were the *Shia* and they called Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ to Kufa. However, it is astonishing to note that there is a strange *fatwa* from the *Shia* with regards to those who killed the Imāms, *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.413 states, ‘In many *Aḥādīth*, it is narrated from the pure imāms that the messengers and their *ausiyā’* and their progeny are not killed except by bastards and no one intends to kill them except those born out of wedlock. May the curse of Allāh be upon them all till the day of judgement.’

The claimants had given the Kufan *Shia*, the glad tidings of hell. Now in the light of this *fatwa* from the imāms, their religious standing has also been specified. It is possible that this *fatwa* has not reached the *Shia* of Kufa. However, the ruling does not change in the case of ignorance. After all, this is a *fatwa* of the pure imāms, not that of any normal person.

One matter that deserves thought is that, well and good, it has been proven that the *Shia* of Kufa are the killers of the imām. However, there is definitely a share of it in it for Yazid because he was the ruler of the time. Regarding this, let us ask the defendant. Probably, they will count him in.

1. *Ihtijāj Tabrāsī* p.162 states that Imām Zayn ul Ābidīn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ مَعَهُ asked Yazid, “I have heard that you had an intention to kill my father.” Yazid replied, “May Allāh curse Ibn Ziyād. By Allāh, I did not instruct him to kill your father. If I was present in the battlefield at Karbala, I would never have killed him.”

The defendant has cleared the name of Yazid. However, this only does not suffice. We should study the circumstances.

2. *Khulāsatul Masa'ib* p.304 states that when Shimr brought the head of the imām in front of Yazid and requested a reward, then Yazid looked angrily at Shimr and said, “May Allāh fill your saddle with fire. Destruction is for you. When you knew that he was the most virtuous of the creation, why did you kill him? Be away from me, there is no reward for you.”

3. According to the *Shia*, Sayyidunā Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ made *taqiyya*. He made *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to the first three *khulafā'* and was also rewarded. In fact, he saved nine tenths of religion and saved his own life. Why did Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ not make *taqiyya*? He would have followed the *sunnah* of his father and he would have got reward too. His life would have been saved and the *Ahl ul Bayt* would have been saved from calamity.

The discussion on the virtue of *taqiyya* is very long. However, we feel it appropriate to mention some of them here:

1. *Usūl Kāfi*, Chapter on *Taqiyya* p.482, has the statement of Imām Ja'far as-Sādiq عَلَيْهِ الْكَلَمُ, 'O Abū Umar, indeed nine tenths of religion is *taqiyya*. He who does not do *taqiyya*, he has no religion.'

2. *Tafsīr Imām Hasan Askarī*, Iran p.129 states, 'Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, "The example of the believer who leaves out *taqiyya* is like a body that has no head."

It is apparent that just as a body is useless without a head, in the same way, faith is of no use without *taqiyya*.

3. *Tafsīr Imām Hasan Askarī*, Iran p.129 states, 'Imām Zayn ul 'Ābidīn said, "Allāh will forgive all the sins of a believer and he will leave the world clean and pure...except two sins, which will not be forgiven. First is abandoning *taqiyya* and second is to destroy the rights of one's brothers.'

It is clear that 'all the sins' states that polytheism and killing the imāms are also worthy of being forgiven. Yes, there is no salvation for one who abandons *taqiyya*. It is as though the people of Kufa had

killed the imām and let him leave the world pure from sin. The imām gave his life and did not get anything because abandoning *taqiyya* is a sin that cannot be forgiven! It remained on him. Oh, the imām who has been doubly oppressed. The irony is that these are the words of the sons of the oppressed imām.

It is for this reason that Abdul Jabbār Mu'tazilī in his book, *Mughnī*, asked a question to the *Shia*, that it is the belief of the *Shia* that *taqiyya* is permissible at the time of every need. If there is fear of losing one's life, then *taqiyya* becomes obligatory. In such a case, the person who does not do *taqiyya* and he is killed, he dies an accursed death. He went against the command of Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. However, in Karbala, Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه not only gave his life, he got the *Ahl ul Bayt* martyred too. The harm is directed to him, as the original reason is that Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه did not do *taqiyya*. If he did *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to Yazid, then he would not have been 'disobedient' to Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and he would have saved his life. However, Sayyidunā Hasan رضي الله عنه made *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā Ali رضي الله عنه made *taqiyya* and pledged allegiance to the first three *khulafā'*. Therefore, what do you, O *Shia*, say with what type of death did Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه experience?

Abū Ja'far Tūsī in *Talkhīs Shāfi* p.471, narrates this question as follows,

'When Ibn Ziyād gave safety to Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه on condition that he pledges allegiance to Yazid, then why did the imām not accept? He would have saved his life and the lives of his associates. Why did he throw these lives into destruction by abandoning *taqiyya* whereas his brother Sayyidunā Hasan رضي الله عنه handed over rule to Sayyidunā

Mu'āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ without any fear. How can the actions of the two brothers be reconciled?’

The answer has been given on behalf of Sharīf Murtadā and Abū Ja'far Tūsī:

'When the imām saw that there is no way of returning to Madīnah Munawwarah, nor is there any way of entering Kufa, he headed for Shām, in order to go to Yazid. In this way he would probably be saved from the calamity that was coming from Ibn Ziyād and his men. He started off and Umar Ibn Sa'd came in front of him with a large army, as was mentioned. Therefore, how can it be said that the imām placed himself and his companions into destruction? This is when it is mentioned in a narration that the imām said to Ibn Sa'd, "I shall choose one of three options; either let me return to Madīnah, **or let me go to Yazid so that I can put my hand into his hand, he is the son of my uncle. He will treat me in accordance to his opinion.** Alternatively, let me go to the borders of the Islāmic Empire, I shall join the Muslims in waging *Jihād*. I shall be a partner to them in their benefit and loss."

From this explanation it is clear that Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ was happy to pledge allegiance to Yazid but the army came in front of him and stopped him. We learn that Ibn Ziyād and the others had captured him and wanted to take him so that they could get a reward.

Another thing we learn is that the *Shia* of Kufa made *taqiyya* and fought against the imām. It is as though two forms of *taqiyya* clashed. The only difference is that the imām was ready for *taqiyya* and the army did practical *taqiyya*.

Talkhīs Shāfi p.471 points out to this reality,

“The army that gathered against Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, they had love in their hearts for him and they desired to help him. Apparently, they were with the enemy.”

Sharīf Murtadā and Tūsī gave the reply to Abdul Jabbār Mu’tazilī but there was another problem. *Mukhtasar Basā’ir ud Darajāt* p.7 states, ‘The imām did not know of the calamity that was coming and he did not know the result of it. The imām is not a Nabī, nor is he the proof of Allāh over the creation.’

The imām had knowledge of the pending calamity. He accepted death by his choice, when he knew, why did he go to Karbala? So, the objection of Abdul Jabbār, ‘why did he put himself into destruction?’ still stands. This is because *taqiyya* would be of benefit if he did it before heading to Karbala. This was not the time to make *taqiyya*, and it seems to be made up.

The Shia sometimes give the answer that this narration is present in the books of debate, it is not mentioned in the books of hadīth, so it is not a proof.

The statement is correct. However, why did their seniors not think of it? Why did Sharīf Murtadā and Abū Ja’far Tūsī give place to this narration in their books? When it came to the question of *Tahrif ul Qur’ān*, they hold onto Tūsī, why is he classified unreliable here? So, we learn that the blemish of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ abandoning *taqiyya* cannot be dealt away with. The question still remains,

according to your principles, what kind of death did Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ experience?

The principle of the death of the imāms being in their control demands that Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ liked his death by his choice. The lovers of Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ should also hold beloved that which he held beloved and give their lives in his remembrance, they should not cry and beat themselves.

At this point, it is appropriate to mention a few more points:

1. The *Shia* say that the imām died thirsty with his companions, but in *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.454, it is written, ‘When he did not get water, then the imām hit a spade behind his tent and a spring of water gushed forth. The imām drank to his fill and he also gave to his companions.’
2. The *Shia* say that the corpse of Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ was trampled by the horses, but *Usūl Kāfi* and *Jilā ul Uyūn* p.503 state, ‘A lion came and sat on the body of the imām and it did not let anyone go close to his body.’

Can you please search for the truth in these conflicting reports?

3. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī explains that the body of the imām was lifted to the heavens after his demise and the angels made *tawāf* of it. So, when the body went to the heavens, who trampled the body on the ground? Whose Raudah has been made in Karbala? Who is buried in this Raudah? Who do you visit in Karbala? If the Raudah in Karbala was made without the body, then what is the problem in making a Raudah everywhere else?

Definitely, it is not within the ability of man to solve the contradictions of the explanation of the *Shia*. There is one more question regarding this, the *Shia* say, “We killed the imām. The hand of Yazid was not in it.” So, it is astonishing to note that if the imām was *Shia*, then why did the *Shia* kill him. We learn that it is actually the other way around. The imām was an Imām of the *Ahl us Sunnah*. His religion was the same as the rest of the Arabs. It is for this reason that the *Shia* of Kufa deceived him, invited him over and killed him. The imām knew that they were *Shia* but he went to reform them. The old malice that the *Shia* had for the imāms was already discussed.

The accepted belief of the *Shia* is that the imāms have very great knowledge; they have knowledge of what happened and what will happen. Looking at this, a person must think that when Sayyidunā Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ had knowledge that Sayyidunā Hasan رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ will hand over rule to Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ was going to give it over to Yazid and the army of Yazid was going to kill Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, then who is the original guilty party? Sayyidunā Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ or Sayyidunā Hasan رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ or Yazid?

We find the answer to this question in *Usūl Kāfi* p.278, it is narrated from Imām Taqī, ‘The imāms permit whatever they want and forbid whatever they want.’ This means that Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ permitted his killing and the killing of his companions, Sayyidunā Hasan رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ permitted the killing of his brother. The result of this is that the person who killed is not the criminal because the one who permits a deed is deserving of reward, not to be a criminal.

Regarding this matter, one more thing is said, that the Sahābah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ had left Rasūlullāh ﷺ by the disbelievers on a few occasions, yet the *Ahl us Sunnah* take them as complete and perfect believers. If the *Shia* did this once to the imām, have they become disbelievers? It is a very grave matter but there are plenty of discrepancies.

1. There is not a single incident from history that proves that the Sahābah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ left Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the clutches of the disbelievers and fled. Therefore, this claim is wrong.
2. Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى Himself states that the Sahābah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ had perfect imān. Therefore, the one who says that Allāh and His Rasūl ﷺ are not reliable, he is free, he can say what he wants.
3. The *Ahl us Sunnah* do not have the right to call anyone a disbeliever. However what will be the response to the following:
 - a. Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ said, “Our *Shia* have disgraced us.”
 - b. Imām Zayn ul Ābidin رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ said, “Destruction be for you, very evil is what you have sent forth for yourselves, you are not from my ummah.”
 - c. Sayyidah Zaynab bint Alī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهَا said, “You will remain in punishment forever.”
 - d. Imām Bāqir رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ says, “Those who pledged allegiance were the same ones who drew out their sword against Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ and the yolk of the pledge to Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ was on their necks when they killed him.”

The people of knowledge and understanding can decide for themselves as to who are the ones who deceived the imām, those who are out of the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, those for whom there is eternity in hell.

4. There is an accusation upon the Sahābah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ عَنْهُ that they left Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the clutches of the disbelievers and fled. However, the matter here reaches very far. They deceived the imām and called him. They promised to join him and fight Yazid. When the imām came, they turned their eyes away. They joined the army of Yazid, stopped the water supply and mercilessly martyred the imām. They disgraced the *Ahl ul Bayt*, looted their wealth. Therefore, where is the accusation and where is the reality? *The irony is that after doing all this, they come out as lovers of the Ahl ul Bayt and beat themselves, whereas Jilā ul Uyūn p.519 and p.527 states that crying and beating started off from Yazid and his house! Therefore, if this is done in following the way of Yazid, then it is correct, otherwise it is apparent and clear that the grief experienced by the relatives of the deceased, that is never experienced by anyone else. We do not find any proof that the Ahl ul Bayt had mourning sessions, julūs and other forms of expressing grief like beating themselves collectively. If this is a form of worship, then it is apparent that there are no greater worshippers than the imāms and the Ahl ul Bayt. Why have they left out this form of worship?*

Summary:

1. With regards to the killing of Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه, the infallible imāms are the claimants and the *Ahl ul Bayt*. They claim that the *Shia* killed them.
2. The killers, the *Shia* of Kufa, confess to the crime.
3. The witness is Imām Bāqir رحمة الله عليه.

If someone claims contrary to this; then,

1. They should present the claim of the imāms and the *Ahl ul Bayt*
2. They should present the testimony of Imām Ja'far رحمة الله عليه and Imām Bāqir رحمة الله عليه

Without this, useless talk has no weight.

Mātam for Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه

The *Shia* trace this ‘worship’, *mātam* for Sayyidunā Husayn رضي الله عنه to the time after his martyrdom. Therefore, we present a number of realities with regards to this martyrdom from the books of the *Shia*. In *Tirāz al-Madh-hab*, Tehran vol.1 p.281, we find an address of Sayyidah Zaynab رضي الله عنها,

‘O deceiving plotters, O people of Kufa, you cry. You have sent very evil provisions forth to the hereafter. May curses and destruction be upon you.’

From this statement of Sayyidah Zaynab رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ we learn one more thing. The people of Kufa plotted and were treacherous in their killing. Then they began to cry and beat themselves. Despite this, they were still worthy of curses and prayers of destruction.

Nāsikh ut Tawārikh vol.1 p.301 has the statement of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, daughter of Sayyidunā Ali رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ and wife of Sayyidunā Umar Ibn al-Khattāb رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ,

‘O people of Kufa, evil is for you, what happened to you? You deceived Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, you killed him and looted his wealth. You imprisoned his wives. Now you cry. May you be destroyed. Do you know whose blood you have spilt? What a great burden of sin you have taken upon your backs and whose wealth have you looted? You have killed the most beloved of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. You have no mercy in your hearts. Listen well, only the people of Allāh will be successful and the group of *Shaytān* will be in loss.’

Besides the plotting, scheming and treachery of the people of Kufa, we learn of a complaint regarding these people from the explanation of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ. After they killed Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, they looted the wealth of the *Ahl ul Bayt* and divided it amongst themselves like inheritance.

From these excerpts it has become clear that the people of Kufa, the *Shia*, had written letters to Sayyidunā Husayn رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ. When he came, they were treacherous and abandoned him. Even worse was that they joined the enemy and killed him. Not only this, they looted the wealth of the *Ahl ul Bayt* and divided it like inheritance.

Nāsikh ut Tawārīkh p.208 also states that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا said, “O people of Kufa, your men killed us and your women cry over us. Well, Allāh will decide between us on the day of judgement.”

The same book on p.311 says, ‘Abū Judaylah Asadī was very surprised when he saw the women of Kufa tearing their clothing and beating themselves. When he asked, he was told, “They saw the blessed head of Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and cried.”

However, the question is that when their men severed the head of Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ without any feeling, so how did the enthusiasm for grief and sorrow come into the hearts of the women? The answer is the same, they killed also and they put the blame on someone else.



Who were the Killers of Sayyidunā Husayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

The detail of the discussion has passed and it has been proven that:

1. According to the clear explanations of the infallible claimants, the *Shia*:

- ❖ Invited the imām to Kufa
- ❖ Opposed the imām after his arrival in Kufa
- ❖ Stopped the water supply
- ❖ Slaughtered the imām mercilessly on the hot sands

- ❖ Looted the tents of the *Ahl ul Bayt*
- ❖ Divided the wealth amongst themselves as booty
- ❖ Cried and hit themselves in a show of grief

After the explanation of the claimants, the confession of the defendant was presented from the reliable book of Shahīd Thālith Nūrullāh Shostarī, *Majālis ul Mu'minīn* vol.2 Majlis 8

2. The most important point is that when the infallible imāms clearly state that the killers were the *Shia* and the criminal has confessed to the crime, why does the third person want to belie this accepted reality?



Cause for the Downfall of the Islamic Empires

The *khilāfat ar-rāshida* was that great rule by means of which Islāmic law and the boundaries of the *Shari'ah* were established. It was the scheme of Ibn Sabā to tarnish the biography of the third *khalifah* and incite the masses to rebel against him. Together with causing a revolution in thought, he also brought about a change in actions and he cause reliance upon the *khilāfat ar-rāshida* to be removed. These rebels made Sayyidunā Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ their target and the *Khawārij* targeted Sayyidunā Ali رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The objective of both of them was the same, to tarnish the lofty standard of the *khilāfat ar-rāshida*.

History bears testimony that after this also; the cause behind the downfall of the Islāmic Empires was mostly the *Rawāfid* (*Shia*). Subsequently, Maulānā Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ writes,

‘History bears testimony that the *mujāhidīn* were always from the *Ahl us Sunnah*. Without them, no-one got the divine ability to do *Jihād* and most of the Islāmic Empires were destroyed at the hands of the *Rawāfid* (*Shia*).’⁷

The *fitnah* of the Tartars was described as ‘Tāmmatul Kubrā’. Allāmah Ibn Qayyim has written that the hand of Naṣīr ud Dīn Tūsī, from the senior *Shia*, was in this *fitnah*. He was the minister of Hulagu Khan. With the authority he had, he destroyed Masājid. In place of the Qur’ān, he gave vogue to *Ishārāt* of Ibn Sinā. He sternly instructed that the Qur’ān was for the masses. *Ishārāt* is the ‘Qur’ān’ for the elite. His effort was to destroy Islām and to bring the teachings of the philosophers, astronomers and magicians into vogue.

On the other side, the minister of the Abbasid *khalīf* was Ibn Alqamī, a *Shia*. He paved the way for the success of Hulagu Khan. The fall of Baghdad is a painful event in the History of Islām, an empire that was 650 years old had come to an end and the greatest share in this was that of the two *Shias*.

In short, the martyrdom of Sayyidunā Uthmān رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ was not an effort to end the life of one person, but it was a lengthy plan to destroy the foundations of Islāmic thought and practice. Because Sayyidunā Uthmān رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَنْهُ was a symbol of Islāmic thought and practice, that is

⁷ *Fayd ul Bārī*

why he was made the target of abuse. Every person has to die one day, but the harm that was caused to Islām through this plan and conspiracy has not ended to this day.



